Ham-Policy Digest   Sat, 6 Aug 94   Volume 94 : Issue 355

Today's Topics:
                        CW ...IS history! (2 msgs)
                              CW VIEWS
                    Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?
                            ITU Treaty
                          Response to Poll
                    What is wrong with ham radio
        Wilensky ...IS history! (and Coastie CW Practice Schedule)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 4 Aug 94 18:13:20 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ...IS history!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky) writes:

>Anyone caught with a Vibroplex key (although they are beautiful in Gold
>Plate) will be force fed prune Juice and have to endure colonic
>irrigation for 30 days until they are ready to join other productive
>members of the Radio Society.

You'll confiscate my Vibroplex Champ only after prying it loose from my
cold, clammy paws, pal. ;-)

Looking forward to making plenty of CW contacts on 6m during the Persieds...

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "We are meant to be masters of destiny,
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | not victims of fate." -- Ronald W. Reagan

----

Date: 5 Aug 1994 13:18:53 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
isuvax.iastate.edu!TWP77@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ...IS history!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Cu0zEB.M95@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
>Hey! I am *not* an Old Fart! I'm only in my late 30's [very late :( ]

In his second year at age 39... :-)

Date: 4 Aug 1994 17:59:55 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!gopher.sdsc.edu!news.tc.cornell.edu!
travelers.mail.cornell.edu!news.kei.com!yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW VIEWS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

You know, if hams are supposed to be a group of people sharing a
common interest in a "service" and "promoting the state of the art," etc.,
then why can't we pull together -- regardless of mode -- and emphasize
what we have in common rather than areas in which we differ? What difference
does it make whether someone likes to use CW or SSB or packet or SSTV, or
whether he/she has a QRP rig or full power? The important thing is that
we respect the other person's rights and opinions and operate in a
courteous manner. What bugs me is the rudeness I've encountered on some
of the HF bands...but that's another story. I like CW...I like sideband...
I like to try a little DX every now and then...and there are worlds of
ham radio I haven't even begun to explore after lots of years in the
hobby...and it's none of my business to tell somebody else his mode is
somehow "less" than mine. I DO think, however, that some kind of code
requirement needs to be retained, both to comply with treaty requirements
as well as in recognition of the heritage of radio communications on HF.

Thanks and 73.

Dorr Depew
N4QIX

Date: Fri, 5 Aug 1994 12:15:25 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!jobone!ukma!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!
xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <080594004026Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
writes:

>>
>>All of this is good, and tends to equip the candidate with sufficient
>>skills except one. You have miserably failed to equip the candidate with
>>the means to interpret over half of what he hears and may need to respond
>>to on HF which is CW QSO's!

>Please quote where you got the proof that half the QSO's are CW (I assume
>you mean manual morse not CW as MANY other modes use CW). If you mean the
>Jeff Herman INFORMAL survey, please document the survey and describe how
>scientific is was and what was the degree of accuracy is involved.
>
>Dan N8PKV

If you really need proof, just run your own survey. You might observe some
other interesting facets while you are at it.

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov

==
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
==
       ..._ .. ..._ ._   _ . ._.. . __. ._. ._ .__. .... _.__

Date: 5 Aug 94 15:03:48 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: ITU Treaty
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

This is a Civics lesson for Alan and Jeff:

    Way back when you guys should have studied government in school, you
    should have learned that when a treaty is ratified by the Senate and
    signed by the President it becomes as binding a LAW as if Congress had
    just passed a bill that the president signs.

Date: 5 Aug 94 12:54:54 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Response to Poll
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

    Some idiot in 73 took a few samples from the Internet on CW and
put them in an article in 73.   So a straw poll may have an impact depending
on who reads this type of thing.   My guess is another idiots will look at
these things and blend and twist in their own opinion - possibly influncing
others. Well in order to offset what I think may be a vocal minority I
would like to register my vote.

VOTE: YES on item 2A.

    I think that maintaining the code at 13wpm

1) Keep code as separate element, at 5wpm.
2) Keep code as separate element, some rate between 5 and 13wpm.
2A) Keep current arrangement (separate element, 13wpm).
3) Fold code test into total test score. At what wpm?
4) Eliminate code testing.

--
David Kirkpatrick N1RBM, Sequoia Systems, Marlboro, Ma
davidk@sequoia.com

Date: 4 Aug 1994 15:21:21 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!gopher.sdsc.edu!news.tc.cornell.edu!
travelers.mail.cornell.edu!news.kei.com!yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <455@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>What I want to know is, if we reduce or eliminate
>the code requirement, are we going to keep the writtens as they are
>(resulting in a decrease in effort/knowledge/skill required to get a
>license), or are we going to increase the other requirements to roughly
>balance the effort/knowledge/skill needed to get a license. It's a
>simple question, really.

Yes, and the simple answer is that nearly every post--if not every
poster--that has advocated getting rid of the code requirements has
also stated that the written tests are too easy. It seems nearly
everyone agrees that they should be changed.

>BTW, please give an example of someone who didn't have to work for
>their Extra.

I, for one, didn't. The toughest part was code and band limits. Both of
I got from operate extensively on HF. (Not work, just normal operation.)

Date: 4 Aug 94 18:04:52 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Wilensky ...IS history! (and Coastie CW Practice Schedule)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky) writes:

>The Coast guard is officialy out of the CW biz.

Date: 4 Aug 1994 19:45:27 GMT
From: newsgw.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <paulf.775859988@abercrombie.stanford.edu>,
<31ot18$7cn@news.u.washington.edu>, <paulf.776023250@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : Hank_Oredson@mentorg.com
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <paulf.776023250@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,
paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
|> cummings@u.washington.edu (Michael Cummings) writes:
|>
|> >>Quid Malborg in Plano. ;-)
|> >Consternation turns to lucidation.
|>

|> Shoes for industry, Compadre?

Guess we're all bozos on this bus ...

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics   Library Operations
Internet   : hank_oredson@mentorg.com   "Parts 'R Us!"
Amateur Radio: W0RLI@W0RLI.OR.USA.NOAM

Date: 3 Aug 1994 21:49:54 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!scorpion.ch.intel.com!
jbromley@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <jim-210794142336@jimsma<435@ted.win.net>,
<31h4m8$7q2@chnews.intel.com>, <454@ted.win.net>.CSU.
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <454@ted.win.net>, Michael Silva <mjsilva@ted.win.net> wrote:

> ... Is there any
> *intrinsic* difference between 13wpm and 5wpm, and can't every argument
> against 13wpm be used against 5wpm? I need someone to explain to me
> why one is unacceptable and the other is acceptable. If we have
> 5wpm, what is to prevent this same fight from springing up all over
> again in a few years. Why, from your point of view, should a hotshot
> RF gunslinger have to learn 5wpm, any more than he should have to learn
> 13? I know if I were arguing the other side, I couldn't accept 5/13ths
> of a dead mode.

There is a well-known "plateau" at 10 wpm. Most people are able to
change their auditory/mental gears, start hearing words instead of
letters, and progress. Others, like me, who can't do that, remain
technician-class amateurs for the rest of their lives. I achieved 5
wpm in a matter of weeks. I am yet to copy 13 wpm without an error
every few letters. Fortunately, I was able to get an accomodation
from the VEC (under threat of a medical waiver) and substitute a
sending test.

There is a world of difference between 5 wpm and 13 wpm. Or between
10 wpm and 13 wpm.

Jim Bromley, W5GYJ <jbromley@sedona.intel.com>

Date: 4 Aug 94 18:00:50 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!newshub.sdsu.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
agate!biosci!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <31jtoj$jus@chnews.intel.com>,
<paulf.775859988@abercrombie.stanford.edu>, <31ot18$7cn@news.u.washington.edu>
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

cummings@u.washington.edu (Michael Cummings) writes:

>>Quid Malborg in Plano. ;-)
>Consternation turns to lucidation.

Shoes for industry, Compadre?

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "We are meant to be masters of destiny,
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | not victims of fate." -- Ronald W. Reagan

----

Date: 5 Aug 1994 20:02:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!
scorpion.ch.intel.com!jbromley@network.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <442@ted.win.net>, <31p9j1$7hk@chnews.intel.com>, <468@ted.win.net>zip
Subject : Re: Tests too easy? Ok. Change what?

>>>> I wrote (a while back):

>>>>There is a great deal of merit in Kevin's suggestion.
     {for mode-specific testing}
>>>>It focuses on expertise required for the operating mode....

In article <468@ted.win.net>, Michael Silva <mjsilva@ted.win.net> wrote:

>Let me just ask what are the problems that this micro-testing is trying
>to solve? Are hams really creating bedlam when they try a new mode?...

Well, it solves the same set of problems for that specific mode that
Morse code testing does for CW. Morse code testing *does* solve a

problem, doesn't it?

Jim Bromley, W5GYJ <jbromley@sedona.intel.com> (My own opinion!)

Date: Fri, 05 Aug 1994 20:20:38 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <jim-210794142336@jimsma<paulf.775434350@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,
<435@ted.win.net><072994181845Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,<450@ted.win.net><31m6kv$a73@new
s.iastate.edu>, <455@ted.win.net><31qq0o$595@hp-col.col.hp.com>
Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <31qq0o$595@hp-col.col.hp.com>, Mike Stansberry (jms@col.hp.com)
writes:
>Michael Silva (mjsilva@ted.win.net) wrote:
>
>: BTW, please give an example of someone who didn't have to work for
>: their Extra.
>
>: Mike, KK6GM
>:
>I feel like being flame bait again, so here goes. I didn't. I was
>having so much fun, it wasn't work!
>
Excuse me, *fun*? That's the quickest way to get kicked out of r.r.a.p.

Actually, Mike, we all seem to need to be hosed down here once in a
while, so thank you for reminding us how much fun we are (or should
be) having in our hobby. Still...ahem...you *were* working, you just
weren't *suffering*. I mean, don't we all sweat when we're engaging in
some of our favorite pastimes? Say no more...wink, wink...nudge,
nudge.

I think I need another dousing.

73,
Mike, KK6GM

Date: (null)

From: (null)
NMN - CAMSLANT Chesapeake

Morse Code: 8741.0 12718.5 16976.0
Code Practice: 5870.0 8090.0 12135.0 16180.0 20225.0 26725.0 (0200-0445 UTC)
               Speeds vary between 6-24 WPM

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "We are meant to be masters of destiny,
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | not victims of fate." -- Ronald W. Reagan

----

Date: Fri, 5 Aug 1994 19:39:03 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!newsfeed.ksu.ksu.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
rhf.bradley.edu!augustana.edu!gganderson@@
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <gganderson.516.775419180@augustana.edu>,
<434@ted.win.net><ZA+SjNS.darrylb@delphi.com>, <440@ted.win.net>u
Subject : Re: A quiet voice for Novice Class NOT time-limited

In article <440@ted.win.net> mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

[stuff deleted]

>I don't understand why anyone would stop at Novice when
>50MHz-to-daylight is 25 simple questions away.
>
>Mike, KK6GM

I'll take a stab at it, Mike, especially since I started this
particular thread. Several reasons:

(1) I currently have no interest in VHF/UHF ops. Someday
when I can afford the HT, yes, for ARES/Skywarn/etc, but not
for now. (Currently I can afford just one rig/radio, so I went
with a used HF rig). I also get turned off by what the crowd
does -- everyone is flocking to 2m, so I didn't want to.

(2) I've wanted to have a Novice license now for some 20 years,
since I first got interested in radio. (I was sidetracked by
college, graduate school, my wife, and starting a career)

(3) I've always been interested in CW. The romantic in me, I guess.

(4) I didn't want to be labeled a "no-code", even by accident,
because of a N9 call. I discovered that was an undesirable option a year
ago last spring when I started to look into ham radio again and started
reading this Usenet group and .misc. Boy is all this code/no-code debate
a turnoff for me.

(5) I could (at the time a year ago June 29th) get the license
by just testing with two Extra-class operators in one of their
homes (this was the day before VE testing became mandatory for
Novices) -- a very pleasant 1-1/2 testing followed by visiting,
shack touring, and ham-talk.

(6) And to prove a point, at least to me if not to others (and this
was the point of my original post), that one does not need many
privileges to get plenty of enjoyment out of ham radio. A Novice
license is a NICE way to be introduced to the hobby. There is
enough to keep me busy enjoying my rediscovered hobby for years
to come!

Enough? Maybe not strong reasons, but sufficient for me.

73 de Kevin, KB9IUA

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #355
****